

Minutes: Process Standardization Working Group Meeting

**Thursday, June 22, 2000
Sheraton Phoenix Hotel (Canyon Room)- 1600 S. 52nd St. Phoenix, Arizona**

	Topic	Lead	Outcome	Att.
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-in, Approval of Minutes	Evelyn Dryer	Ms. Dryer welcomed participants to the meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants are listed in Attachment 1. Participants introduced themselves. Ms. Dryer reviewed the ground rules. Salt River Project proposed new language to the ground rule concerning Salt River Project. Ms. Dryer will attach an amendment to the ground rules to address the error. The minutes from the May 30, 2000, meeting were approved with one correction to add Jeff Woner as a participant.	1
2	VEE Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Janie Mollon	Ms. Mollon presented a status report of the VEE Subcommittee. The VEE Subcommittee had two proposals to present to the Process Standardization Working Group (PSWG) for approval. Both proposals were approved. The proposals and the voting results are shown in Attachment 2.	2
3	Metering Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Renee Castillo	Ms. Castillo presented a status report of the Metering Subcommittee. Reports have been implemented. A new form "Equipment Purchase Authorization" was introduced at the Metering meeting. A recommendation concerning Issue 33 was presented to the PSWG for approval. The recommendation was approved through consensus. The issue and resolution are on Attachment 2. The Metering Subcommittee set the following priorities for the next two months: 1) ESP-UDC switch, 2) meter maintenance, 3) MADEN, and 4) new meter sets. The Metering Subcommittee discussed CT/VT issues: the status of APS ownership policy and MSP capability to maintain CT/VT. Two issues related to Issue 65 were identified: performance monitoring (referred to VEE) and MRSP certification (potential issue for future PSWG meeting).	2
4	Billing Subcommittee Status Report and Recommendations	Shirley Renfro	Ms. Renfro presented a status report of the Billing Subcommittee. UNI number was added to the BEN process, and BEN will be implemented. The Billing Subcommittee assigned new issues to itself. One issue is what happens if an MRSP cannot get an actual read and the customer switches. A final bill usually is not estimated. A second issue is how to handle unmetered accounts.	
5	Discussion of Issue 78	Evelyn Dryer	Issue 78 was discussed. Commission Staff will discuss the issue at the next PSWG meeting. Participants can submit position papers by e-mail to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by June 30, 2000. Issue 78 and concerns expressed at the PSWG meeting are in Attachment 3.	3
6	Discussion of Issue 61	Laurie Goggin	Ms. Goggin led a discussion concerning Issue 61. Issue 61 and principles and concepts mentioned at the PSWG meeting are in Attachment 3.	3
7	Prioritization of Policy Group Issues	Laurie Goggin	Remaining Policy Group Issues were prioritized. Issue 79 was assigned to Metering. Issue 80 was set to priority 1. Issue 81 was set to priority 3 and assigned to DASR. Issue 82 was assigned to Billing. Issue 83 was set to priority 1. Issue 73 is currently set to priority 1. These issues are listed in Attachment 3.	3
8	Set Next Agenda	Laurie Goggin	Discussion was held about adding a note to future agendas that items will be discussed and may be voted on. Issues 61, 78, 80, and 83 will be on the next agenda. The next meeting will be held July 18-20 at the Sheraton Hotel.	

PARTICIPANTS AT JUNE 22, 2000
PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP MEETING

Name	Organization
Erinn Andreasen	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
Jana Brandt	Salt River Project
Debbie Brown	Salt River Project
Marvin Buck	Computer Sciences Corp.
Greg Carrel	Salt River Project
Renee Castillo	Salt River Project
Anne Cobb	Trico Electric Cooperative
Steve Crouch	Citizens Utilities
Deborah Diaz	Tucson Electric Power Company
Evelyn Dryer	Tucson Electric Power Company
Donna Easterly	Arizona Public Service Company
Gene Gerhart	Salt River Project
Tony Gillooly	Tucson Electric Power Company
Bob Gray	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
June Greenrock	Salt River Project
Janet Henry	Phaser Advanced Metering Services
Marta Kalleberg	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
Barbara Keene	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
Paul Michaud	Mohave Electric Cooperative
Rick Molina	Tucson Electric Power Company
Janie Mollon	New West Energy
Larry Nuszloch	Salt River Project
Darrel Pichoff	K.R. Saline & Associates/Electric District No. 3
Shirley Renfro	Arizona Public Service Company
Bill Rigsby	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
Jenine Schenk	Arizona Public Service Company
Gene Slechta	Systrends
Stacy Smith	Arizona Public Service Company
Judy Taylor	Tucson Electric Power Company
Jack White	Salt River Project
Ray Williamson	Arizona Corporation Commission Staff
Jim Wontor	APS Energy Services

Facilitators = Patricia Sorensen and Laurie Goggin, City of Mesa

VOTING RESULTS OF P-1 AND P-2

Proposal P-1: Ten percent or more estimated intervals in a billing cycle will be marked as an estimated bill.

Proposal P-2: The MRSP shall not round or truncate interval data with respect to the number of decimal places generated by their meter reading system.

Organization	P-1	P-2
Tucson Electric Power	yes	yes
Salt River Project	yes	yes
Trico Electric Cooperative	yes	yes
Citizens Utilities Company	yes	yes
Arizona Public Service	yes	yes
Computer Sciences Corp.	yes	yes
APS Energy Services	yes	yes
Electric District No. 3	yes	yes
Phaser Advanced Metering Services	yes	yes
New West Energy	yes	yes
Mohave Electric Cooperative	abstain	abstain

ISSUE 33

Issue 33: For access to a meter, some UDCs require the ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from the customer. In many cases, the customer does not have the key.

Resolution: For customer supplied locks, the MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply the customer with a new lock and keys. It is the customer's responsibility to get the new key to the UDC. The MSP will communicate access changes back to the UDC on the MIRN form in the remarks section

Issue 78: There is no language in the rules keeping the MSP from contracting directly with the customers, how should this issue be addressed?

Concerns expressed at PSWG meeting:

Many UDCs are not set up to accept DASRs from MSPs. They will have primary relationship with customer. Model does not allow for that.

Out of scope of this group - general premise of open competition. (Is this within PSWG purview.)

If UDC gets DASR from ESP, they need to fill out data from MSP. They won't have contractual relationship - customer does.

ACC rule intent to let marketplace decide how that occurs.

CC&N language change may take care of issue without going to rule change.

Needs to be decided by ACC - Is this within the purview of PSWG?

Issue 61: Who is the “due process” for tracking the performance of MSPs and MRSPs? What is the process for communicating this information? Who do we report the problems too? What are the processes once the complaint has been made? Etc.

Principles and concepts mentioned at PSWG meeting:

Who is responsible for tracking?

How is performance/nonperformance communicated, and who are the parties to communication?

What are possible timelines for performance and communication?

CUBR has standards for performance.

POLICY GROUP ISSUES:

Issue 73: Is NERC using Standard Central Time in Non-EDI transactions? Why is NERC using Standard Central Time and should we be using it?

Issue 79: Explore additional electronic methods for transmitting metering data.

Issue 80: What are the security and encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data?

Issue 81: What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent?

Issue 82: Prior Balances – In the models for ESP consolidated Billing being suggested, once the customer bills, the receivable is transferred to a holding account for the ESP to pay off.

Issue 83: MRSP Certification needs to be revamped to test the ability of the MRSP. A proposed option to test the MRSP may be to send production data from an active meter. A committee should be formed to establish a realistic process to test and access the performance of an MRSPs. Best practices should be the foundation in formulating the performance standards.